

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request continued examination of this application.

Claims 4, 5 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form with one additional change. The “determining if” limitation has been changed to “determining that” to avoid the possibility of interpreting the claims to read on a method where the only thing required is to look at the tension member and decide that there are no breaks. The dependencies of claims 7-9 have been changed in view of the cancellation of claim 1.


The rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) can be withdrawn.

There is nothing in the *Bruyneel, et al.* reference (or the other references or record) that teaches or suggests securing a broken wire end to an adjacent unbroken wire as recited in the pending claims. The *Bruyneel, et al.* reference does not teach any kind of handling of a broken wire end. The other references of record disclose other types of techniques for splicing wires together or otherwise dealing with broken wires but none of them disclose or suggest the techniques recited in claims 4, 5 or 6. There is no *prima facie* case of anticipation and the rejection can be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS



David J. Gaskey, Reg. No. 37,139
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: April 20, 2010

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\UP00127 PUS1\PATENT\Amendment 4-10.doc